

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 3, 6-8, 11, 15, 18, 21, and 42 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 40, and 41 have been amended, and claims 43-54 have been newly added. Support for the amendments is provided at least in the original claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claims 3 and 6-8, claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claim 15, and new apparatus claims 43-54 have corresponding subject matter to method claims 1 and 14 and their dependent claims.

Claims 1-21 and 40-42 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Saito et al. (US 2002/0172207). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse based on the points set forth below.

Claim 1 recites features of canceled claims 7 and 8 and now defines a radio communication management method in which: (1) a server sets a predetermined tentative permission time for which a mobile terminal tentatively permits access to a desired network and (2) the server sets a time for acquiring an authentication result by an authentication process. The Office Action proposes that Saito discloses this subject matter (see Office Action page 4, last paragraph, through page 5, second paragraph).

More specifically, the Office Action proposes that Saito discloses Applicants' claimed feature (1) by disclosing that a gateway router sets a lifetime of a routing cache for each of a plurality of mobile nodes in accordance with a routing update interval time (see Office Action page 5, lines 1-5 of the second paragraph). However, Saito's disclosure of a gateway router that

sets a lifetime of a routing cache for each of a plurality of mobile nodes is not identical to the Applicants' claimed subject matter of a server that sets a predetermined tentative permission time for which a mobile terminal tentatively permits access to a desired network. Moreover, a router is not identical to a server; thus, Saito's router is not identical to the Applicants' claimed server and does not perform identical functionality.

The Office Action also proposes that Saito discloses Applicants' claimed feature (2) by disclosing that a gateway router sets a lifetime of a routing cache for each of a plurality of mobile nodes in accordance with a routing update interval time (see Office Action page 4, last four lines). However, as mentioned above, Saito's router is not identical to the claimed server. Moreover, the Office Action has identified one operation of Saito's router as corresponding to two distinct and different operations performed by a server in Applicants' claimed features (1) and (2).

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Saito does not identically disclose the subject matter defined by claim 1 and, thus, does not anticipate claim 1. Independent claims 14, 43, and 50 similarly recite the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing method claim 1 from the applied references, although claims 43 and 50 do so with respect to apparatuses. Therefore, allowance of claims 1, 14, 43, and 50 and all claims dependent therefrom is deemed to be warranted.

To promote a better understanding of the patentable distinctions of the claimed subject matter over the applied references, the Applicants provide the following additional remarks.

The Office Action proposes that Saito discloses the subject matter recited in Applicants' claim 1 of (1) a server that sets a predetermined tentative permission time for which a mobile

terminal tentatively permits access to a desired network and (2) the server setting a time for acquiring an authentication result by an authentication process. The Applicants submit that these claimed features are not found in Saito. Saito discloses that a pure-micro gateway router sets a lifetime of a routing cache for each of multiple mobile nodes in accordance with a routing update interval time included in a routing update message, upon receipt of the routing update message including a current address of the mobile node (see Saito paragraph [0054]).

On the other hand, the special technical features recited in Applicants' amended claims 1, 14, 43 and 50 are intended to solve the problem that a packet from an IP network does not reach a mobile terminal during authentication of the terminal or until a binding process (i.e., the exchange of a binding update and binding acknowledgment) is completed (see specification page 12, lines 1-5). (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Access is supposed to be denied according to the conventional method until the completion of authentication. However, according to the special technical features described in Applicants' amended claims 1, 14, 43 and 50, a server sets a time until acquiring an authentication result by an authentication process and sets a predetermined tentative permission time for which a mobile terminal tentatively permits access to the desired network, enabling the mobile terminal to have temporary access to the desired network during the predetermined tentative permission time.

Based on the above points, it is submitted that the special technical features described in Applicants' amended claims 1, 14, 43 and 50 are quite different from the teachings of Saito.

Therefore, it is submitted that Saito does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claims 1, 14, 43 and 50 and all claims dependent therefrom.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: June 30, 2009  
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter  
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 008638-05102  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 659-6966  
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559  
DC 8638-5102 138385v1